

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as now presently amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-27 have been amended. Claims 1-27 are active in the application.

Applicants' invention pertains to a pluggable video module (PVM) and a cage into which the PVM is inserted. The PVM processes digital video signals. The shape of the PVM can be similar to the shape of other modules that are incapable of processing digital video signals. Thus, in addition to the PVM, Applicants invented a way of preventing the other look alike modules from being plugged into the cage of the host device. Applicants incorporated a key slot on the PVM and a key tab on the cage. The key slot of the PVM accepts the key tab of the cage. If the module does not have a key slot, then the key tab of the cage will prevent the module from plugging into the cage of the host device. Independent Claims 1, 14, 26, and 27 are directed to the PVM. Independent Claim 24 is directed to the cage. Independent Claim 25 is directed to the combination of the PVM and the cage. Each independent claim is addressed below.

Independent Claim 1 recites a PVM having a housing, a locking and release mechanism, an electrical connector, an optical connector, and a key slot. The housing has a top, a bottom, a front, and back. The locking and release mechanism is near the front of the housing for securing the PVM to a host device. The electrical connector is near the back of the housing for electrically connecting the PVM to the host device. The optical connector is near the front of the housing for receiving another optical connector. The key slot is on the bottom of the housing and is near the back of the housing for receiving a key tab from the host device. If the module that is inserted into the host device does not have a key slot, then the module will not be allowed

to be plugged into the host device. The key slot has three edges. Support for the amendment made to Claim 1 is found in Figures 2, 4, and 7.

Independent Claim 14 recites a PVM having a housing, a locking and release mechanism, a first electrical connector, a second electrical connector, and a key slot. The housing has a top, a bottom, a front, and back. The locking and release mechanism is near the front of the housing for securing the PVM to a host device. The first electrical connector is near the back of the housing for electrically connecting the PVM to the host device. The second electrical connector is near the front of the housing for receiving a third electrical connector. The key slot is on the bottom of the housing and is near the back of the housing for receiving a key tab from the host device. If the module that is inserted into the host device does not have a key slot, then the module will not be allowed to be plugged into the host device. The key slot has three edges. Support for the amendment made to Claim 14 is found in Figures 2, 4, and 7.

Independent Claim 24 recites a cage having a top, a bottom, opposite sides, a front, a back, an opening, and a key tab. The opening is near the front of the cage for receiving a PVM. The key tab extends beyond an inside surface on the bottom of the cage. The key tab is formed by raising a cut out portion of the cage towards an inside of the cage. If a module is inserted into the host device does not have a key slot for receiving the key tab, then the module will not be allowed to be plugged into the host device. Support for the amendment made to Claim 24 is found at page 8, pre-numbered lines 11-12.

Independent Claim 25 recites the combination of a PVM and a cage. The cage includes a key tab. The PVM includes a key slot that is sized to receive the key tab of the cage. The key tab is formed by raising a cut out portion of the cage towards an inside of the cage. The key slot has three edges. If a module is inserted into the host device does not have a key slot for

receiving the key tab, then the module will not be allowed to be plugged into the host device. Support for the amendments made to Claim 25 are found at page 8, pre-numbered lines 11-12, and Figures 2, 4, and 7.

Independent Claim 26 recites a PVM having a housing, a locking and release mechanism, an electrical connector, an optical connector, a key slot, and pathological circuitry. The housing has a top, a bottom, a front, and back. The locking and release mechanism is near the front of the housing for securing the PVM to a host device. The electrical connector is near the back of the housing for electrically connecting the PVM to the host device. The optical connector is near the front of the housing. The key slot is on the bottom of the housing and is near the back of the housing for receiving a key tab from the host device. If the module that is inserted into the host device does not have a key slot, then the module will not be allowed to be plugged into the host device. The pathological circuitry handles pathological conditions associated with digital video signals. The pathological circuitry includes a capacitor having a value of 4.7uF. The capacitor having the value of 4.7uF helps to enable the circuitry to properly process the digital video signals. Support for the amendment made to Claim 26 is found at page 12, pre-numbered lines 1-9.

Independent Claim 27 recites a PVM having a housing, a locking and release mechanism, a first electrical connector, a second electrical connector, a key slot, and pathological circuitry. The housing has a top, a bottom, a front, and back. The locking and release mechanism is near the front of the housing for securing the PVM to a host device. The first electrical connector is near the back of the housing for electrically connecting the PVM to the host device. The second electrical connector is near the front of the housing for receiving a third electrical connector. The key slot is on the bottom of the housing and is near the back of the housing for receiving a

key tab from the host device. If the module that is inserted into the host device does not have a key slot, then the module will not be allowed to be plugged into the host device. The pathological circuitry handles pathological conditions associated with digital video signals. The pathological circuitry includes a capacitor having a value of 4.7uF. The capacitor having the value of 4.7uF helps to enable the circuitry to properly process the digital video signals. Support for the amendment made to Claim 27 is found at page 12, pre-numbered lines 1-9.

Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Branch, et al in view of Kriegisch, et al.

As discussed above, Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Branch, et al in view of Kriegisch, et al.

The Branch, et al reference discloses a standard Small Form Factor Pluggable (SFP) transceiver. The Branch, et al reference was cited for disclosing every feature of the claimed invention except for “a key slot on the bottom and proximate the back of the PVM for receiving a key tab from a host device.” Thus, the Branch, et al reference lacks the claimed feature of “a key slot on the bottom and proximate the back of the PVM for receiving a key tab from the host device, and thereby allowing the PVM to be inserted into a host receptacle of the host device having the key tab, and wherein the key slot has three edges,” as recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, the Branch, et al reference is not believed to anticipate or render obvious Applicants’ claimed invention as recited in amended Claim 1.

The Kriegisch, et al reference was cited for disclosing “a key slot on the bottom and proximate the back of the PVM for receiving a key tab from a host device.” Applicants are unable to identify the “key slot” discussed in the Office Action. Applicants note that the Kriegisch, et al reference discloses a locking plate 15 (see Figure 1) which mates with dead bolt

32 (see Figure 2) of a lock 14 (see Figures 1 and 2). Applicants do not believe that the locking plate 15 and the dead bolt 32 provide a keying function at the bottom and near the back of a PVM. Furthermore, Applicants note that the Kriegisch, et al reference discloses that the plug-in unit 2 is mounted to the base plate 3 via holding means 28 (see Figure 2). Thus, Applicants believe that the Kriegisch, et al references lacks the claimed feature of “a key slot on the bottom and proximate the back of the PVM for receiving a key tab from the host device, and thereby allowing the PVM to be inserted into a host receptacle of the host device having the key tab, and wherein the key slot has three edges,” as recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, the Kriegisch, et al reference is not believed to anticipate or render obvious Applicants’ claimed invention as recited in amended Claim 1.

Kriegisch, et al was cited in combination with Branch, et al for rendering obvious the claimed invention. The Kriegisch, et al reference provides no teaching to overcome the shortcomings of Branch, et al in regard to amended Claim 1. Thus, amended Claim 1 is believed to be clearly allowable over these references.

The same arguments as set forth above apply to rejected Claims 2-13, which depend from amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 1-13 are believed to be clearly allowable over the references of record.

As discussed above, Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Branch, et al in view of Kriegisch, et al.

The teachings of Branch, et al and Kriegisch, et al have been discussed above.

Amended Claim 14, similar to amended Claim 1, recites a key slot having three edges. Therefore, both the Branch, et al reference and the Kriegisch, et al reference lack the claimed feature of “a key slot on the bottom and proximate the back of the PVM for receiving a key tab

from the host device, and thereby allowing the PVM to be inserted into a host receptacle of the host device having the key tab, and wherein the key slot has three edges,” as recited in amended Claim 14. Therefore, the Branch, et al reference and the Kriegisch, et al reference are not believed to anticipate or render obvious Applicants’ claimed invention as recited in amended Claim 14.

Kriegisch, et al was cited in combination with Branch, et al for rendering obvious the claimed invention. The Kriegisch, et al reference provides no teaching to overcome the shortcomings of Branch, et al in regard to amended Claim 14. Thus, amended Claim 14 is believed to be clearly allowable over these references.

The same arguments as set forth above apply to rejected Claims 2-23, which depend from amended Claim 14. Accordingly, Claims 14-23 are believed to be clearly allowable over the references of record.

As discussed above, Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Branch, et al in view of Kriegisch, et al.

The Branch, et al reference was cited for disclosing “a host cage (14).” The Branch, et al references discloses that numerical designator 14 is associated with “a mounting bracket,” col. 5, lines 15-19. The Office Action acknowledges that the Branch, et al reference lacks the feature of a key tab. Thus, the Branch, et al reference lacks the claimed feature of “a key tab extending beyond an inside surface on the bottom of the host cage, whereby the key tab is formed by raising a cut out portion of the host cage towards an inside of the host cage,” as recited in amended Claim 24. Therefore, the Branch, et al reference is not believed to anticipate or render obvious Applicants’ claimed invention as recited in amended Claim 24.

The Kriegisch, et al reference was cited for disclosing a key tab. Applicants are unable to identify the “key tab” discussed in the Office Action. Applicants note that the Kriegisch, et al reference discloses a locking plate 15 (see Figure 1) which mates with dead bolt 32 (see Figure 2) of a lock 14 (see Figures 1 and 2). Applicants do not believe that the locking plate 15 and the dead bolt 32 provide a keying function at the bottom and near the back of a PVM. Furthermore, Applicants note that the Kriegisch, et al reference discloses that the plug-in unit 2 is mounted to the base plate 3 via holding means 28 (see Figure 2). Thus, Applicants believe that the Kriegisch, et al references lacks the claimed feature of “a key tab extending beyond an inside surface on the bottom of the host cage, whereby the key tab is formed by raising a cut out portion of the host cage towards an inside of the host cage,” as recited in amended Claim 24. Therefore, the Kriegisch, et al reference is not believed to anticipate or render obvious Applicants’ claimed invention as recited in amended Claim 24.

Kriegisch, et al was cited in combination with Branch, et al for rendering obvious the claimed invention. The Kriegisch, et al reference provides no teaching to overcome the shortcomings of Branch, et al in regard to amended Claim 24. Thus, amended Claim 24 is believed to be clearly allowable over these references.

As discussed above, Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Branch, et al in view of Kriegisch, et al.

The teachings of Branch, et al and Kriegisch, et al have been discussed above.

Amended Claim 25, similar to the combination of amended Claims 1 and 24, recites a key slot having three edges, and a key tab formed in a cage. Therefore, both the Branch, et al reference and the Kriegisch, et al reference lack the claimed features of “a key tab extending beyond an inside surface on a bottom of the cage, whereby the key tab is formed by raising a cut

out portion of the cage towards an inside of the cage,” and “a key slot on the bottom and proximate the back of the PVM sized for receiving the key tab in the cage, and thereby allowing the PVM to be installed into the cage, and wherein the key slot has three edges,” as recited in amended Claim 25. Therefore, the Branch, et al reference and the Kriegisch, et al reference are not believed to anticipate or render obvious Applicants’ claimed invention as recited in amended Claim 25.

Kriegisch, et al was cited in combination with Branch, et al for rendering obvious the claimed invention. The Kriegisch, et al reference provides no teaching to overcome the shortcomings of Branch, et al in regard to amended Claim 25. Thus, amended Claim 25 is believed to be clearly allowable over these references.

As discussed above, Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Branch, et al in view of Kriegisch, et al.

The Branch, et al reference discloses a standard Small Form Factor Pluggable (SFP) transceiver. The Branch, et al reference was also cited for disclosing “pathological circuitry (16, 18) for handling pathological conditions associated with digital video signals.” The Branch, et al reference at col. 5, lines 21-27, and col. 5, lines 46-50, associate numerical designator 16 with electronic circuitry, and numerical designator 18 with a circuit board. The Branch, et al reference does not discuss the pathological condition associated with digital video signals. The Branch, et al reference does not disclose a circuit having a capacitor having a value of 4.7uf so as to solve the problems of properly transmitting and receiving digital video signals. Thus, the Branch, et al reference lacks the claimed feature of “pathological circuitry for handling pathological conditions associated with digital video signals, and wherein the pathological circuitry includes a capacitor having a value of 4.7uF,” and “a key slot on the bottom and

proximate the back of the PVM for receiving a key tab from the host device, and thereby allowing the PVM to be installed into a host receptacle of the host device having the key tab,” as recited in amended Claim 26. Therefore, the Branch, et al reference is not believed to anticipate or render obvious Applicants’ claimed invention as recited in amended Claim 26.

The Kriegisch, et al reference has been discussed above. Thus, Applicants believe that the Kriegisch, et al references lacks the claimed features of “pathological circuitry for handling pathological conditions associated with digital video signals, and wherein the pathological circuitry includes a capacitor having a value of 4.7uF,” and “a key slot on the bottom and proximate the back of the PVM for receiving a key tab from the host device, and thereby allowing the PVM to be installed into a host receptacle of the host device having the key tab,” as recited in amended Claim 26. Therefore, the Kriegisch, et al reference is not believed to anticipate or render obvious Applicants’ claimed invention as recited in amended Claim 26.

Kriegisch, et al was cited in combination with Branch, et al for rendering obvious the claimed invention. The Kriegisch, et al reference provides no teaching to overcome the shortcomings of Branch, et al in regard to amended Claim 26. Thus, amended Claim 26 is believed to be clearly allowable over these references.

As discussed above, Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Branch, et al in view of Kriegisch, et al.

Amended Claim 27, similar to amended Claim 26, recites pathological circuitry having a capacitor having a value of 4.7uF, and a key slot. Therefore, both the Branch, et al reference and the Kriegisch, et al reference lack the claimed features of “pathological circuitry for handling pathological conditions associated with digital video signals, and wherein the pathological circuitry includes a capacitor having a value of 4.7uF,” and “a key slot on the bottom and

proximate the back of the PVM for receiving a key tab from the host device, and thereby allowing the PVM to be installed into a host receptacle of the host device having the key tab,” as recited in amended Claim 27. Therefore, the Branch, et al reference and the Kriegisch, et al reference are not believed to anticipate or render obvious Applicants’ claimed invention as recited in amended Claim 27.

Kriegisch, et al was cited in combination with Branch, et al for rendering obvious the claimed invention. The Kriegisch, et al reference provides no teaching to overcome the shortcomings of Branch, et al in regard to amended Claim 27. Thus, amended Claim 27 is believed to be clearly allowable over these references.

Applicants have made other grammatical and clarifying amendments to the specification.

The above changes to the specification, and claims are self-evident from the original disclosure. Therefore, it is believed that no new matter has been introduced, and no new issues have been raised.

In view of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are definite and in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By Karl D. Kovach

Karl D. Kovach
Reg. No.: 40,278
Stratos International, Inc.
Attorney for Applicants
7444 West Wilson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60706
(708) 867-9600

I hereby certify that this paper and/or fee is being deposited
With the United States Postal Service First-Class
mail on this 30th day of September, 2005,
and is addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for
Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Karl D. Kovach